Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and appreciative of the greatness of the man and his works. The difficulty of such a task is very great, as all know who have followed at all the critical activity of the Goethe scholars during the past few decades. It seems that almost all the valuable general works on Goethe of the past twenty-five or thirty years have aimed to appeal rather to scholars than to the general public. Profound studies of Goethe's genius and personality like those of Schöll, Hehn, or Otto Harnack can certainly not be intended for the uninitiated reader. On the other hand, the popular works that have appeared within the last few years are, with the exception of Grimm's lectures on Goethe, either intolerably dry and pedantic, or dangerously superficial.

Two biographies have finally appeared which will doubtless make Goethe better known and appreciated throughout the world. We refer to those by Richard M. Meyer and Karl Heinemann. Fortunately these two works to a large degree supplement each other. Meyer's chief aim is to popularize and, as far as possible, to summarize the best critical scholarship on Goethe's thought and poetry. He touches upon the facts of Goethe's life only in so far as they are absolutely necessary for understanding a discussion of the poet's works. He thus assumes, on the part of the general public, a knowledge of Goethe which, in our opinion, hardly exists.

Heinemann has a decidedly more popular aim. He writes distinctly for the beginner in the study of Goethe. His main intention is to inspire the reader with the personality of the poet and, therefore, he dwells only upon such of Goethe's works as are the clearest and most immediate expression of his personality. The main stress of the book is laid upon the environment of Goethe and its influence upon the character and genius of the poet. In so doing, Heinemann merely carries out Goethe's own idea expressed to Eckermann in 1825.

"People talk forever of originality, but what does it all mean! As soon as we are born, the world begins to operate upon us and continues to do so to the end. And everywhere, what can we call especially our own, except energy, strength and will? *If I should declare to what extent I am indebted to great predecessors and contemporaries, not much would be left.*"

Accordingly, Heinemann presents to us a series of literary portraits of all the men and women who in any way reacted upon Goethe. The material which he gives us is by no means new, but it is entirely reliable. He generalizes with excellent judgment, and sketches with much force and clearness important literary movements. Especially strong are, for instance, his portraiture of Herder, and his sketch of the Storm-and-Stress movement. The full, and yet very careful and concise presentation of literary and biographical facts offered by Heinemann, will make the book particularly useful to American students who wish to obtain a general comprehensive view of the life and times of Goethe.

The book contains, besides, several hundred well-executed pictures of Goethe's friends and acquaintances, and of the various interesting places of his abode. Very suggestive are the numerous portraits of Goethe himself, which, in their wise arrangement, give us some idea of the spell that his personality exercised upon all who knew him. The book is written in so fluent and clear a style that it holds the interest of the reader to the very end. We are never made to feel the very extensive and solid learning which is at the author's command. In short, Heinemann's biography will do much toward making the real Goethe better known to the world at large, and should certainly supplant the very unreliable biography of Lewes and the lifeless work of Düntzer.

MAX WINKLER.
University of Michigan.

ORIGIN OF ITALIAN POETRY.

La Poesia Siciliana Sotto Gli Svevi, da G. A. CESAREO. Catania: 1894. 8vo, pp. xi, 412.

DURING the past year quite a number of publications have appeared, having for their subject the question of the origin of Italian vernacular poetry in Sicily. The most pretentious of these publications is that of Cesareo; his book is replete with suggestive ideas which serve to render a persual of it as inviting as that of many productions of less scholarly import. Notwithstanding this, however, his work is disappointing in one particular. He devotes two thirds of his treatise to

an endeavor to disprove the different theories of foreign influence on the Sicilian school; in the last part of the book, then, we naturally expect to find strong arguments adduced in favor of the native origin of the school, but such is not the case, and the effect left on the mind of the reader at the conclusion is that something is lacking,—that a large portico has been constructed, out of all proportion to the small edifice behind it.

The title itself is significant; the author's investigations do not include any literary manifestation of a date later than the battle of Benevento,—thus we see that while the division by Dante of early Italian poetry into two schools—the Sicilian and the "dolce stil nuovo"—suffices to recall the two most prominent features of this poetry, the distinction does not satisfy the critical spirit of the modern specialist. I believe the latter is in the right, however; surely neither the form nor the content of the school of Frederick the Second remained the same when transplanted into Tuscany, and many stages of transition may be marked between the manner of Giacomo da Lentini and that of Guittone d'Arezzo. Cesareo appreciates this fact and expresses a wish that some one will study "la poesia toscana di transizione" (p. 305).

The entire work is divided into three chapters: Chap. i, I Poeti (pp. 1–64); Chap. ii, La Lingua (pp. 65–241); Chap. iii, La Poesia (pp. 243–412).

In chapter i (The Poets), the author shows that in the last years of the twelfth century the Sicilian court was so favored as to be the scene of a rivalry between Arabic and Latin poetry; the former yields before the victorious Roman idiom which, in turn, loses its popularity when the new vulgar Sicilian (the object of investigation in our present volume) manifests itself. Cesareo does not advance more than ten pages in his first chapter before he pronounces himself upon one of the several striking points of his book: he does not assign to Provençal literature the influence upon the Sicilian school which the former has always been supposed to have exercised. No trustworthy record exists of a native Provençal poet who lived at the Sicilian court, or of a Sicilian poet who wrote in Provençal; our author does not venture to deny that Provençal poetry was known in Sicily, and that *langue-d-'oc* bards passed more or less time in that region; but this fact does not cause him to waver in his position. He attempts to demonstrate that Sicilian vernacular poetry had received its vital impulse before Frederick the Second ascended the throne of the empire, and before Provençal influence could have insinuated itself; the first proof of this assumption is indirect, the second direct. The writer intimates that life in Sicily was entirely different from that of other parts of Italy and that a poet from southern France would probably have found little congeniality there.

The oldest Sicilian *canzone* for which an approximate date may be posited is one that, judging from internal evidence, must be of the year 1205. We cannot conceive that this attempt of Giacomo da Lentini was the first essay of the Sicilian school; on the contrary, the composition presupposes a long period of preparation of the popular speech for artistic expression. Now Frederick's influence was not potent previous to 1220,—an epoch when the school had long since completed its initiatory stages—after this date the Emperor, learned and brave, a lover of every science and liberal art, a master of languages and literatures, gratefully takes under his protection the pioneers who had dignified the dialect of his favorite domain, and the popular becomes a court school.

Cesareo devotes the greater part (pp. 25–64) of his initial chapter to short sketches of the lives of twenty-four poets; the information possessed on the career of most of these men is limited. Accompanying each biography we find an enumeration of the *canzoni* that belong to each given author, and also an indication of the manuscripts in which these *canzoni* are preserved. In this section of his book we note again a new departure in our investigator's method. He proposes that a line shall be drawn between what he considers two generations of Sicilian poets,—that of the time of Frederick and that of the time of Manfred. We are prepared to appreciate the importance which Cesareo evidently designs to attach to this division only when we have followed him considerably further in his ex-

position. On p. 205, for example, we observe that, in upholding the popular Sicilian as opposed to the Provençal origin of the school, he criticises Gaspary for his failure to distinguish between the two generations; our writer asserts that the second family of poets was far more infused with the spirit of the literature of France than was the first, and that Provencalisms in the second prove nothing with regard to the poetic antecedents of members of the earlier race.

The opening chapter is closed by another novel point of view to be added to those already mentioned: The old text, *Le Ciento Novelle Antike*, while possessing a recognized linguistic value as one of the earliest specimens of Italian prose, is often consulted also for its incidental references to historical events, and, in lieu of other records, the testimony of this monument is as a rule accepted. Now in the twenty-eighth *novella* of this collection the writer says:

"Lo Imperadore Federigho fue nobilissimo singnore, ... et chi avea alchuna speziale bontade, a llui veniano: trovatori, sonatori, belli parlatori . . . . . et d'ogni maniera genti."

So far as I know, every one up to the present who has interested himself in the matter has taken it for granted that the "trovatori" here referred to were Provençals; Cesareo, however, does not interpret the word in this manner; he inclines to the belief that these "trovatori" represent the Sicilian poets themselves.

Chapter ii, devoted to a study of the language of the Sicilian poets, is a masterly piece of work; it indicates on the part of the author not only a knowledge and appreciation of the philological researches of previous students of the Sicilian dialect but also a practical command of the varieties of speech employed at present in southern Italy. After occupying about twenty pages with reviews of the important controversies which, from the time of Dante till our own day, have cast mingled light and shade on the questions that arise concerning the language of the Sicilian school, Cesareo enters upon his own investigation of the problem. He has the advantage of a knowledge of several texts unknown or inaccessible to Gaspary. We note in this connection a methodical consideration of the phenomena of phonology, morphology and syntax treated in the order here mentioned. The author does not believe that a copyist has arbitrarily transformed all the original rhymes of these early poets, neither will he admit that the latter had faulty conceptions of rhythm (a suspicion first expressed by Celso Cittadini and sustained in our own day by Monaci). On the contrary, the fact that, to correct form, one codex restores a rhyme rendered imperfectly in another manuscript indicates that originally all, or nearly all, the rhymes were faultless. Gaspary has posited the assertion that if we were to translate the poems as we now know them into the Sicilian dialect, some rhymes would be destroyed; Cesareo allots little weight to this idea since (he says) the old language was characterized by certain forms which have not been preserved in the modern, and the Sicilians, in order to enrich their native dialect, may have borrowed vocables from other districts or refashioned their own words on the model of the Latin.

This study of the Sicilian idiom (thus considered by itself) having been concluded, the author now faces the question of the influence of the Provençal language on the Sicilian. Gaspary treated as Provencalisms in the Sicilian poems all words that could be explained only by the laws of Provençal phonology and not by those governing the formation of Italian speech-elements. This method certainly furnished a safe norm and Cesareo does not essay to controvert it; he does, however, attempt to reduce the number of words which may rightfully be supposed to be Provençal. At this point of the investigation the writer proffers two statements which do not correspond to the general scholarly character of his treatment of his subject and which, in my opinion, render him but meagre support in his attempts to annul the theory that Provençal influence was a strong factor in the development of the Sicilian school. He grants that numbers of Provençal words had found their way into the Sicilian dialect as a natural consequence of the political and commercial relations which bound Sicily and Southern France; but, he ventures to assert, this ex-

change may have occurred before the action of any literary influence of the latter country upon the former. Sicilian poets writing at a date posterior to this extensive introduction of Provençal words, may have adopted these words from the living speech of the people at the same time that they appropriated indigenous forms, but with an entire lack of consciousness of their Provençal origin. Evidently, there is no way of establishing his position on this point, so Cesareo simply repeats his suggestion five times on as many pages (207–211). Since such repetition does not warrant any conclusion, he is naturally impelled to seek refuge in a general remark to the effect that it is impossible to arrive at an assured judgment when we consider the present transitory stage of the whole problem. Every day new texts (examples of which he fails to specify) are being discovered; these often make evident that words and locutions in a given speech-district were borrowed exclusive of any literary influence; the science of the history of our dialects is not yet sufficiently advanced to enable us to distinguish with precision native and foreign elements; as a matter of fact, we do not know what the actual state of the Sicilian dialect may have been during the first years of the thirteenth century!

After this digression on Provençal influence the author makes an interesting résumé of the results of his investigations on the language of the poems; his first table (pp. 212–214) concerns the vowels, the second (pp. 214–215) the consonants and morphology. His summary, in brief, is the following: In the forty Sicilian poems recorded in the codices known at present, there are about a hundred rhymes and more than six hundred words which are essentially Sicilian; therefore, one may infer that there existed an extensive dialect basis for the language of the first poets of the school. This statement Cesareo strengthens by a negative argument: it has been said repeatedly that all the poets of the Sicilian school availed themselves of a common language that was not the idiom of any one particular territory, but constructed with the aid of several prominent early dialects among which the Tuscan predominated. In order to ascertain if such was the case, Cesareo searches for Tuscan rhymes in Sicilian verses; these compositions do reveal rhymes foreign to Sicilian, but they are readily explicable as due to imitation of the Latin. We are uncritical in supposing that the members of the school—learned clerks, judges, doctors and notaries—copied the Tuscan, unless the especial Tuscan vowel differed from the Latin with which the poets were familiar. Cesareo argues finally (p. 225) that in these forty poems,—after substracting forms common to Sicily and Tuscany, after noting their passage through several generations of amanuenses intent upon Tuscanizing them—there are three codices which do preserve one hundred rhymes and six hundred words and locutions which are strictly Sicilian. Of these words not one has been conclusively proved to be imported from dialects other than those of the neighboring South. Therefore, it must be evident that the old Sicilian bards wrote in Sicilian—"siciliano illustre; siciliano latineggiante e un po' provenzaleggiante; siciliano aulico, curiale, cardinale; siciliano elegante e letterario quanto si vuole; ma siciliano."

We now arrive at the third and last chapter which is a painstaking treatise on the many points of interest which bear upon the content of the poems. Cesareo opens the chapter by inviting attention to the distinctions to be borne in mind between the compositions of the reign of Frederick and those of the time of Manfred, claiming that the former were more vivid, spontaneous and unaffected by foreign influence; a marked propensity for Provençal innovations asserted itself only in the writings of the younger set of Sicilian troubadours, manifested its full power in Guittone d'Arezzo and endured until the time when Guido Guinicelli, seeking within the recesses of his own spirit a source of inspiration, established a new philosophic school.

On pages 257–284 we have a study of the verses of Giacomo da Lentini, in whose career our author traces three different artistic tendencies that correspond to three successive stages of intellectual development in the life of that poet. The first manner of Giacomo is to be observed in his *bourgeois* poetry—characterized by a natural and sincere expression of love and untainted by courtly affectation as

well as by popular crudity. The second betrays an overweening fondness for the stately Provençal style. The third tendency is represented by what Cesareo denominates "doctrinal" poetry. Several pages of the work before us are given up to a scrutiny of this peculiar manifestation of Giacomo's genius; the claim is even advanced that the element of learned images and comparisons was introduced into poetic literature by the celebrated notary; this claim, however, cannot be considered as definitely established, since there was a certain Richart de Barbezieu (who, according to Diez, flourished during the first years of the thirteenth century) whose *canzoni* were replete with allegories derived from the science of his day. In order, then, to make Giacomo antedate Richart, Cesareo, by means of a series of ingenious hypotheses, endeavors to persuade us that the incident concerning Richart referred to in the *Ciento Novelle Antike* occurred in 1240 when that bard was a young man. Our author attributes to Giacomo still greater prominence when he asserts that the sonnet was invented by the latter. The doctrinal poetry was cultivated by but a small number of the master's contemporaries, who either did not comprehend or did not like it; on the other hand, the sonnet rapidly won popular favor, and, after having been improved in the hands of Guittone d'Arezzo, became the kind of composition most cherished in Tuscany and at Bologna.

Cesareo now passes in review another species of composition essayed by members of the Sicilian school, though not by Giacomo. This new style is entitled *la poesia popolaresca realistica*. The latter is to be distinguished from the *poesia borghese* in that the realistic verse represents the passions and ideas of the masses of the people; the content is vulgar, the method objective, and we fail to discover any suggestion of the influence of chivalrous formulae. The best representative of the *borghese* style was Giacomino Pugliese, whose work, however, is infected by popular, realistic characteristics. Cesareo, in the course of seven pages, portrays the efforts of this author and then enumerates the most prominent members of the *borghese* school, among whom were Frederick ii, Rinaldo d'Aquino and Guido delle Colonne.

The apostle of the realistic school was Cielo dal Camo, author of the famous *Contrasto*, beginning with "Rosa fresca aulentissima". The present critic adds thirty to the hundreds of pages already covered by discussions on the various aspects of this author. The date assigned by D'Ancona for the composition of the poem (between the years 1231 and 1250) is not questioned, but Cesareo is not prepared to admit with D'Ancona that Cielo was a native of Sicily. Caix was the first to suspect that the language of the poem was not Sicilian and termed it *pugliese*, while the present investigator inclines to the belief that the dialect coloring of Cielo's piece points toward a Neapolitan background. It will be found upon examination that where supposed Sicilian forms appear, these forms are identical in every case with corresponding Neapolitan phenomena, whereas many additional Neapolitan characterestics, unknown to Sicilian, may be discovered; some of these are the preference for *e* instead of *i* both pretonic, tonic and final (*asemenare*, *pentesse*, *parente*); diphthongization in cases like *castiello*, *tiempo*, *niervi*; use of *b* for *v* (*abere*, *bolontate*). Another Neapolitan peculiarity occurs in the versification of the *contrasto*. The metrical combination of alexandrines and hendecasyllables is encountered only in compositions belonging to the dialect of Naples.

Our author does not agree with Caix that there exists in the *contrasto* an evident imitation of French pastorals. The treatment of the subject of the poem is such as would suggest itself to any imaginative mind; we even find a model of the species among the idyls of Theocritus. The French and Provençal words do not indicate anything as to literary imitation; the southern Italian dialects have garnered French, Arab, Provençal and Spanish words as the result of conquest and immigration, but it would be disastrous to wager that a Neapolitan who to-day uses *guappo*, *gilecco*, *riffa* or *locco* may be an imitator of Lope or Calderon! In this same section Cesareo inserts a sarcastic refutation of the arguments of Jeanroy who upholds the theory of French imitation in the "Rosa fresca." As to the personality of the author of the *Contrasto*, our

author thinks the idea of his having been a noble is based only on legend; he was more probably a plebeian of some education who wandered from castle to castle, from *piazza* to *piazza*, singing his song, which is not wholly popular, but more nearly so than any other work of art of the thirteenth century.

The writer now reviews that realistic poetry which was written by learned literary men as opposed to the plebeian Cielo. This poetry may be classed under four types: 1—The *Canzone di Commiato* in which the hero, about to depart from his beloved, gives and receives the most tender assurances of affection; 2—The *Canzone della donna innamorata* in which the lady expresses her unreciprocated passion for some cavalier; 3—The *canzone della mal maritata* in which the woman complains to her lover of the sufferings she endures through her association with an uncongenial husband; 4—The *canzone della donna abbandonata* in which the female character inveighs against the ill-omened destiny that has separated her lover from her. After illustrating these four themes by numerous selections, and mentioning the more prominent writers on each theme, Cesareo proposes (p. 351) two questions concerning the compositions and with a consideration of these points his book closes. The first question is: Were these themes native to Italian popular poetry or were they imported from the other side of the Alps? The second is: Granting that they were indigenous, how did they originate and develop? Cesareo takes up each one of these themes separately, and seeks for corresponding French or Provençal equivalents. The subject of the *mal maritata* is treated in the poetry of France; to ascertain if the Italian is in this particular an imitation of the French, the writer examines the three *genres* of the French lyric defined by Gröber in the latter's examination of Bartsch's collection. Prominent among these *genres* are the *canzoni a personaggi* (so called by Gaston Paris;—by Jeanroy, *canzoni drammatiche*) and our author admits that on the surface there is an alliance between the latter and the Italian *mal maritata* more evident at first sight than that between the *contrasto* and the *pastourelle*. On the other hand, there are essential differences which indicate that the relationships discovered are such as one would naturally expect. Our author can but admit that the Italian *trovatori* must have been acquainted with the popular poetry of France and Provence, but just at this point we are introduced to another fine distinction which will probably not carry conviction to the minds of all readers: the critic intrenches himself behind another general statement to the effect that "altro è conoscere, altro è imitare" (p. 368). It will certainly be a literary feat when some one shall establish a means of proving that a given French locution used by an Italian poet (who had seen it in a French poem) would have been adopted by him, even if he had not seen it before!—We find next considered the *canzone della donna* ("e segnatamente della fanciulla") *innamorata*, the most frequent source of inspiration in old as well as in modern popular Italian poetry. The claim is made that while this species and likewise that of the *canzone di commiato* may be found in France in the thirteenth century, the oldest known examples are assuredly Italian; at the most, our author is not willing to concede more than that the theme was disseminated over all Romance territory, and that it germinated and developed in different ways in different countries. The same may be said of the *canzone della donna abbandonata*.

After this rather minute examination covering nearly forty pages, some general arguments are adduced in favor of the originality of the Italian themes; for example, the species of semi-learned poetry most preferred in France and Provence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were the *alba*, the *pastourelle*, the *chanson d'histoire* and the *chanson à personnages*. Now, of these, the first three are quite unknown to Sicilian poetry, and the development of the latter kind in Italy was on lines different from those followed in France. Cesareo claims that if the Italian poets had wished to introduce French matter into Italian it is natural to suppose that they would have selected that class of composition which they knew was already popular with their neighbors. Again, all the French and Provençal *chansons à personnages* and *pastourelles* are characterized by a conventional, technical

formula of introduction that relates how the poet-knight, riding from one place to another, heard and saw that which he proceeds to recount. This prelude is wholly wanting in the efforts of the Sicilian poets. Again, the obligatory reference by the French songsters to Spring, flowers, gardens and birds would scarcely have been omitted (as we find it) by the Sicilians had the latter been imitating the French.

Cesareo now arrives at his second question (the manner of the origin and development of the Italian poetry, granting that it is indigenous). This problem is the more difficult and the less satisfactorily answered for the reader as well as for the author, who frankly acknowledges (p. 393) that what he has to say is in the line of conjecture. This inability to prove the native Sicilian origin of the poetry that he has just tried to show as not borrowed from French or Provençal, certainly does not strengthen his position on the latter point. What renders also his conjectures less weighty, is the fact that for examples of early popular poetry he does not confine himself to Sicily, but merely supposes the existence in this province of forms popular in other parts of Italy.

Having thus summarized the contents of this book, it may be of value to call attention again to the points of the same which have appealed to the reviewer as novel or striking. In brief, then, Cesareo holds: 1—Little Provençal influence is to be traced in the Sicilian school; the latter was well under way before Frederick the Second flourished. 2—The school was, in its inception, popular and became a court school only when Frederick acted as its Maecenas. 3—Two generations of Sicilian poets must be distinguished, those of the time of Frederick, and those of the time of Manfred. 4—The term, "trovatori" occuring in the *Ciento Novelle Antike* may refer to the Sicilians themselves. 5—There is an extensive background of characteristic Sicilian words in the language of the early poets of the school. 6—Provençal words may have come into Sicily before the exercise of any literary influence of Provence upon the latter country. 7—We should account as Tuscan words, in the poems, only those whose vowels are not the same as the vowels of the corresponding Latin words. 8—Giacomo da Lentini introduced the doctrinal element into poetry and invented the sonnet. 9—Cielo dal Camo was a Neapolitan, not a Sicilian: a plebeian, not a noble. His poem was not an imitation of a French pastoral. 10—In content the popular Sicilian poetry is free from French and Provençal influence.

L. Emil Menger.
Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ROMANCE WORK AT PARIS IN 1895-96.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—Romance studies have been extremely well cultivated this year at the various schools in Paris. The subjects treated were of the highest importance, and, for the most part, not at all elementary; not one course given in former years was abandoned, while one chair that had been vacant since '88 was filled during the first semester. Pretty nearly all the schools offered some work useful to the Romance student. At the École des Chartes, M. Léon Gautier lectured and conducted practical exercises on Paleography, and M. Paul Meyer lectured on Romance Philology. At the Sorbonne, M. Brunot and M. Thomas both had the same subject; once a week they lectured on French Phonetics and once a week also they explained Old-French texts. At the Collège de France, M. Morel-Fatio, substitute of M. Paul Meyer, explained Old Spanish, and M. Gaston Paris, now its administrator, could be heard twice weekly. At the École des Hautes Études, M. Morel-Fatio held his seminar on the "Libro de Alexandre." M. Gilliéron lectured on the French dialects, M. Thomas treated Vulgar Latin, and finally, M. Gaston Paris continued his seminar on Romance Lexicology, begun some three years ago.

But that one may the better compare the work done here with what is offered in Romance Philology at some of our American colleges, and chiefly that those students who intend to spend next year in Paris may know beforehand what they are likely to get, some of the courses mentioned call for a more de-